

A & S EMERGENCY MEETING	21
SENATE MINUTES—meeting of January 11	21
SENATE MINUTES—meeting of January 22	26
MINUTES COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATION—meeting of January 29	29
STUDENT HOUSING POSITION	30
BROADENING OF BOARD	31
ACADEMIC ANNOUNCEMENTS	31
NOTICES OF MEETINGS	31

A & S emergency meeting on Feb. 4

February 4th's emergency meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Science heard for the first time a suggestion from the Quebec government that McGill may have to maintain its college equivalent program for two generations of students.

The suggestion came in a telegram from Yves Martin, Quebec's Associate Deputy Minister of Education, to Vice-Principal Oliver, in answer to a letter asking clarification on matters relating to the CEGEP equivalent program McGill may offer next fall. The program has been accepted in principle by the Faculty for one generation (two years) only.

Faculty positions regarding the two generation suggestion varied from advocacy of a rigid stand on acceptance of one generation only (on the basis that to do otherwise would risk the quality of the education McGill could provide), to suggested flexibility in recognition that the government was in financial difficulties and thus it was almost the duty of the ministry to have made the suggestion.

One Faculty member wondered whether it meant the government was unsure the west island and south shore CEGEPs could be ready by fall 1970.

Dean Woods said that the Faculty had originally been strongly against any five-year program, but had accepted it on the one-generation basis to be in a good bargaining position as regarded the possible linkup with St. Joseph's Teachers College and the move of the Faculty of Education.

The only way McGill could physically accept a second group of college equivalent students in 1970 would be by postponing the Faculty of Education move and thus shortchanging that Faculty.

Prof. Valerie Pasztor asked if McGill would be operating in concert with the other English-language Quebec universities in perhaps refusing the five-year program.

Prof. Elton Pounder, a member of the Collegial Studies Committee, noted that thus far Sir George Williams and Bishops had tended to follow McGill's lead, but pointed out they had no problems comparable to the Faculty of Education move.

(Sir George has said it will accept entering groups of college equivalent students for three years, Bishops for as long as necessary.)

After reviewing the Martin telegram and telling

Faculty of the verbal assurances he had on some of the points, Dr. Oliver noted that the date for Dawson College's occupancy of the Frosst Building was a late July 15, and that for a fall 1970 opening the Education building would have to be begun this April, "and before one can begin with digging one should know the size of the building to be built."

He suggested that Faculty should decide at the meeting whether the University's position had been met to sufficient degree by the government to warrant going ahead via Senate with the five-year program.

Faculty passed, with 10 abstentions (39 for, 17 against) a motion by Prof. John Trentman to: "recommend strongly to Senate that the stated position of the Faculty regarding the autonomy of teaching and a one-year transition period not be compromised in any future arrangements made with the provincial government."

An amendment put by Prof. Theodore Morris, saying that Faculty appreciated the attempt of the Government to clarify the issues set out in Prof. Oliver's letter, but was dismayed that only one item was answered in full, and was in particular dismayed by the suggestion regarding acceptance of a second generation of collegial students on campus in September 1970, when the Education Faculty would have moved to Montreal, did not pass.

Senate minutes

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1969 AT 9:00 A.M. IN THE COUNCIL ROOM OF THE LEACOCK BUILDING.

96. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Dean Hall MOVED that the agenda be adopted.

As an amendment to the motion Professor Durnford MOVED:

"That the adoption of the agenda shall not, with respect to any items on it which relate to matters previously decided by Senate, be construed as waiving the requirement for a motion to reconsider, passed after the notice of two-thirds of the members of Senate present at the meeting which considers it, before the agenda items in question can be discussed and voted upon anew."

Professor Durnford explained that this was the same motion that was presented by Mr. Brown at the last meeting and which had had force only for that particular meeting. He asked that the Steering Committee be requested to propose that this same motion should have effect at all future meetings.

Mr. Hyman spoke on the question of reconsideration, saying that it pertained only to the reconsideration of a vote within a given session and not to a vote taken at an earlier session.

The amendment was then voted upon and carried.

Mr. Hyman referred to Recommendation 2 in the report of the Nominating Committee presented at the last meeting pertaining to the Joint Committee of

Governors and Senate to Maintain a Continuing Review of University Government. As an amendment to the motion, Mr. Hyman MOVED that this question be removed from the table and placed at the top of the agenda. The amendment was carried.

As an amendment to the motion, Professor Vogel MOVED that item B VI b), the motion on the structure of the Graduate Faculty, be deleted from the agenda, and this amendment was carried.

Mr. Brown rose on a point of privilege, and read an extract from the *McGill News*. As an amendment to the motion, Mr. Brown then MOVED that the following resolution be adopted:

"That Senate hereby affirms its respect for, and its complete confidence in, Principal Robertson as chairman of its meetings; and That Senate dissociates itself from both the substance of, and the offensive language used in, the contrary opinion attributed on page 5 of the November, 1968 issue of the *McGill News* to Mr. Peter Foster in the following terms: 'And, of course, the other problem is the authoritarian, shall we say even fascist, control of Senate proceedings by the Principal, who is chairman.'"

In speaking to this motion, Mr. Brown said that the chairman of Senate has been fair to the point of leaning over backwards. He said he believed it was the responsibility of members of Senate to move that the question be put at any time they felt that two-thirds of the members were ready to vote on a given question. The motion to put the question was the only method of finding out if two-thirds of the members were ready to vote. He also urged that members should refrain themselves from speaking on a given question to the greatest extent possible. He said he felt that Senate had been placing an undue burden on the chairman by its failure to observe these two measures in the past.

Mr. Foster said that his comments quoted in the *McGill News* were off-the-cuff comments for an interview. He added that he had personal confidence in the chairman and he believed that he was fair in applying the rules. It was the powers possessed by the Chair he had objected to, i.e. the power to close debates and to make rulings not subject to appeal. With regard to Mr. Brown's proposal that members should use the device of putting the question, Mr. Foster added that the function of Senate was to discuss issues so that the campus would know what they were. The application of this device would stop debate on issues which needed a full airing.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried unanimously.

As an amendment to the motion, Professor Sandiford MOVED that the resolution be adopted:

"That Senate adopt for today's meeting the following procedure:

The Chairman allocate latest starting times for each agenda item in such a manner that all items receive consideration by noon. Debate on all items requiring further discussion when the allotted time expires will be continued during the afternoon."

Mr. Hyman pointed out that on October 31 student members had placed important motions on the agen-

ITEMS FOR THE GAZETTE

The GAZETTE is published weekly throughout the academic year. Deadline for submitting items for publication is Monday of the week prior to the week of publication. Materials for the GAZETTE should be forwarded to the Editor, Harry E. Thomas, Rm. 630, Administration Building.

da and had now waited two and a half months to hear them discussed. He said he felt that Professor Sandiford's motion would diminish the time available to discuss these motions. Professor Sandiford replied that his intention was not to cut down the amount of time available for each motion, but to identify those items which required loud discussion.

Dean Woods pointed out that in the establishment of the newly constituted Senate the proper business of Senate was not being proceeded with. The student members, he felt, were making far too many interventions, and Senate felt disquiet and frustration over the situation. He urged that members of Senate should seriously consider whether or not they should speak on a given question. Mr. Edel replied that the student members were vastly outnumbered on Senate. He himself spoke infrequently, and when Mr. Hajaly and Mr. Hyman spoke they were speaking for him as well as for other students. The few student members represented a broad body of student opinion. He concluded by saying that he was opposed to any time limits being imposed.

The amendment was discussed further by several members, Professor Horowitz expressing his reservation that a great deal of time would be spent in merely deciding times. Mr. Caron expressed his views, and Mr. Hajaly said that the amendment would suspend the rules of order. The amendment was then voted upon and was lost.

The motion to adopt the agenda, as amended, was then voted upon and carried.

97. ELECTION TO NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Principal reported that the Steering Committee would meet on January 15, and that there was no report to present at the present meeting. The Principal added that the result of the ballot for the Nominating Committee of Senate had been circulated showing that the following nine elected members of Senate had been elected: Professors I. Anhalt, C. D. Gordon, Frances Henry, C. P. Leblond, G. A. MacLachlan, Helen Neilson, P. J. Sandiford, R. Vogel, L. Yaffe and students Robert Hajaly and Ian Hyman.

98. CONTINUING REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Hyman MOVED, as he had at the last meeting, that the composition of the Joint Committee of Governors and Senate to Maintain a Continuing Review of University Government should be: four students appointed by the Students' Council; four members of the staff chosen from the six already named by the Nominating Committee; with the Governors requested to add four of their members.

Professor Pavlasek said he did not feel it proper for Senate to specify to the Governors how many members they should appoint, and added that on a representative committee like this members of the Graduates' Society might also be appointed. It was pointed out by the Principal, Mr. Edel, and Mr. Hyman that the request to the Governors to name four members was a recommendation and not a specification.

Professor Leblond said that this question had not appeared on the agenda of today's meeting and hence he was unprepared to vote on it. As an amendment he MOVED that the motion be withdrawn until the next meeting. Professor Horowitz pointed out that the question could be dealt with under item D b) ii of the agenda, business arising from the meeting on December 18.

Mr. Foster made the point that the matter had been on the agenda for the last meeting and if it was not dealt with this would mean a delay of another month.

Mr. Grey suggested that the matter was not urgent and that time could be taken to study it. Professor Malloch pointed out that the matter was urgent since the first task of the new committee would be to consider student representation on selection committees for Deans. The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and lost.

The main motion was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 24 to 10.

Professor Frankel suggested that in order to be consistent the student members of the Nominating Committee should not take part in action with regard to the formation of the Committee on University Government. In response to a question from Professor Malloch, the Principal said he believed that the Governors had not yet named their members of the committee.

99. DEPOSIT OF SENATE MINUTES

For information, the Secretary reported that Senate Minutes were now deposited in the following places:

Redpath (McLennan) Library
Macdonald College Library
Medical Library
Student Council Offices on the Macdonald and Montreal campuses.

Mr. Foster asked whether retroactive sets of Senate Minutes could also be deposited in the same places. After brief discussion, the Principal pointed out that the complete minutes were available to any member of Senate in the Secretary's Office. In response to a question from Mr. Hyman, the Secretary said that the minutes were not deposited in these places until they had been approved by Senate, although some minutes, not yet approved, had been published in the *McGill Reporter*.

100. MCGILL REPORTER

It was agreed that discussion of the *McGill Reporter* should be deferred until the next meeting, since Professor Yaffe, who had placed the matter on the agenda, was not able to be present at today's meeting.

101. CO-OPERATIVE RESIDENCE

Mr. Hajaly outlined the developments which had taken place with regard to the plans of the Students' Society to construct a co-operative residence. Despite the University's support, the Quebec Housing Corporation had refused a request for a loan. The site first envisaged was no longer available because the Students' Society had not option money available. The two main alternatives were for the University to invest in the property or for the Governors to make a loan. The Governors had offered a loan of \$500,000 but this was contingent upon approval from Quebec which had not been forthcoming. Quebec had suggested using the resources of Co-op Habitat, but this would mean that the Students' Society would exercise no control over the construction of the building or its operation.

Mr. Hajaly then MOVED that the following motion be adopted:

"Be it resolved that Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that student housing be given high priority and that everything possible be done to facilitate the construction of the Students' Society proposed high-rise cooperative residence, and specifically that the Board of Governors either give the Students' Society a mortgage on the residence as per the feasibility report submitted to the Board, or establish ownership on its own, again according to the plan of the feasibility study."

Mr. Shaw said that he was basically in sympathy with the viewpoint expressed by Mr. Hajaly, but that approval from Quebec was required for all building projects, and that this project was already in the University's submission to Quebec. The University had agreed to lend \$500,000 and to engage in a lease-back arrangement. There was to be a meeting with the Co-op Habitat authorities next week, and Mr. Shaw said he felt the question should be postponed until that meeting had taken place.

Mr. Hajaly said that meetings had been taking place with Co-op Habitat since last summer but that there was no indication that body would be willing to relinquish any of its powers to the Students' Socie-

ty. He added that if the University was to invest in a property it would receive a better return than on most of its investments. Mr. Foster added he believed that Co-op Habitat did intend to exercise all its powers.

Professor Leblond asked about the control of admissions, standards and rules in the new residence, and the Principal said that these had been gone into exhaustively and approved by the Board of Governors. Mr. Grey spoke of the criteria of admission that would be used.

Dean Woods said that Senate should give its strong moral support to the proposal but that he did not feel it proper for Senate to make specific financial recommendations to the Board of Governors. He agreed with Mr. Shaw that the matter should be delayed until the next meeting. Professor Woodsworth said that if there was no objection to the proposal in substance it should be proceeded with. Mr. Shaw said that he would have no objection to the motion being passed at this time.

As an amendment to the motion Professor Maître then MOVED that the following resolution be adopted:

"The Senate supports the principle of the cooperative residence undertaken by the Students' Society with the understanding that the residents will be selected without any consideration of race, of political and religious opinions, and of views regarding the nature and future of the University."

Several student members pointed out that the motion only expressed the intention of the Students' Society in any case, and Mr. Hyman suggested that the words "with the understanding" be deleted and replaced with the words "having assurance that". The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried.

In discussion of the main motion, Professor Leblond said that it differed from the original motion that had been presented and questioned therefore whether it was a proper motion. The Principal ruled that the changes were within the rights of the mover and that it was a sound motion.

Dean Woods said he felt that the motion was flogging a dead horse since the Governors had already given all the support they could. Dean Cohen added that it was right for Senate to support the proposal in principle but not to propose the financial technique by which it would be accomplished. Mr. Hyman pointed out that the Governors had never reached a decision concerning the granting of a mortgage and that the question of obtaining a site was an urgent one.

As an amendment to the motion, Professor Johnston MOVED that the second clause, the words reading "and specifically that the Board of Governors, etc." be deleted. Professor Johnston pointed out that the technicality of financing was a non-academic matter and not in the competence of Senate.

Mr. Foster said that the original motion was simply stating the question of what should be done. The Principal said that in his opinion the question was not that simple. The motion was a proper one, but the financial details were not a question for Senate, and the Board was doing everything in its power. Mr. Hajaly said that given the present Quebec situation the matter should be proceeded with by the use of McGill resources, and that the present actions by the Board were not sufficient. Professor Noumoff spoke against the amendment, saying the Senate should go on record as favouring the use of University resources.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 22 to 17.

The main motion, as amended, was then voted upon and carried.

102. FURTHER MOTION ON HOUSING

Mr. Foster said he had another motion on housing to present, which originated in the Students' Society Housing Committee, namely that a Committee on

Academic Residences be established to report back to Senate and the Board of Governors.

As an amendment to the motion, Professor Yates MOVED that this proposal, fully documented and detailed, be referred for consideration to the Steering Committee of Senate. This amendment to the motion was carried.

103. ADVERTISING OF SENATE MEETINGS

On a point of privilege Professor Maître read an advertisement which had been published in the *Montreal Gazette* and the *Montreal Star* advertising today's special meeting of Senate. This advertisement had been published by the Students' Society of McGill University. He directed a question to the President of the Students' Society asking what the purpose of this advertisement had been.

Mr. Hajaly replied that he had been considering raising a point of privilege concerning the notice of today's meeting. He said that neither the *McGill Daily* nor the *McGill Reporter* were being published this week. An open meeting was meaningless unless those concerned knew about it; furthermore, a number of important student motions were to be presented at this meeting. Early in the week he had asked Mr. Tunis whether the University would advertise the meeting in the public press. Mr. Tunis had referred the question to the Secretary of Senate who had given the reply that Senate had not authorized the advertising of its meetings in the public press. Subsequently the students decided to place such an advertisement. He added that this question would come up in the future, especially during the summer, when there was no conventional way of notifying students about Senate meetings. He suggested that the question might be discussed when the amendments to the Report on Open Meetings were proposed.

Professor Leblond asked whether it was proper for members of Senate to place advertisements concerning Senate meetings. There was some discussion of the wording of the advertisement, and Mr. Hyman said the wording could have been in any form the University wished if it had itself placed the advertisement.

Dean McGregor then MOVED that it was a proper act for the Students' Society to place the advertisement.

Dean Cohen referred to the wording of the advertisement, saying that the selected agenda technique was a form of editorializing. Professor Maître added that the item referring to "political grounds" meant that this was not a mere matter of advertising. Dean Woods pointed out that Senate should not be debating the contents of the advertisement but whether it had been proper for the students to place it.

The motion was then carried, with three members dissenting.

104. COMMITTEE ON COLLEGIAL STUDIES

Mr. Hyman said he had previously moved that two student members be added to the Committee on Collegial Studies. Since then he had discovered that the committee was larger than he thought, consisting of sixteen members. He MOVED therefore that four student members be added to the Committee on Collegial Studies. He also asked for a report on what the Committee was doing.

Professor Leblond said that the motion should not be changed now the matter had come up for debate. He had been prepared to vote for two student members, and now he was faced with the prospect of voting for four.

Professor Frankel reviewed the work of the Committee on Collegial Studies. Last session the Committee had considered the three main alternatives of retaining the four-year programme, of introducing a four-year plus summer programme, or of changing to a five-year programme. The five-year approach had been debated and adopted, and this had led to the present negotiations with the Quebec Government. Since then smaller groups had been working on the modalities of how this plan would be

implemented. Dean Woods added that he believed the basic work of the committee had been done and that the Faculty of Arts and Science had established a Commission, under the chairmanship of Dr. Stansbury, to study various Collegial problems.

Mr. Hajaly said that in view of the impending transitional, one-year, one-generation programme the committee had a role in coordinating, accelerating and adjusting etc. He then MOVED as an amendment to the motion:

"That Senate instruct the Committee on Collegial Studies where necessary to initiate, accelerate, coordinate, finalize and present to Senate plans for adjustment to the proposed five-year CEGEP transitional and final programme".

The Secretary reported that Dr. Pounder had informed him that the Committee would meet in the near future and was already addressing itself to such problems. Dean Woods said he felt it was unnecessary for the mandate of the committee to be broadened in the terms of the motion proposed by Mr. Hajaly. Professor Horowitz, on the other hand, said he believed that the Committee's mandate should be broadened. Dean McGregor asked about the existing terms of reference of the Committee, and Professor Frankel said he thought these were probably broad enough at present, but that the motion added an extra element of precision.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried, with one member dissenting.

The main motion, as amended, was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 27 to 5.

105. GRADING SYSTEM

Mr. Edel MOVED that the following motion be adopted:

"Be it resolved that Senate establish an ad hoc committee to re-evaluate and prepare a report on the effect of the present grading system, and alternatives to it."

Mr. Edel spoke to his motion, proposing further that on this committee there be parity of members of Faculty and students.

Mr. Foster, the seconder of the motion, and Mr. Grey also spoke on this subject, Mr. Grey saying that a global study was needed.

Mr. Brown asked whether the Committee on Academic Policy or some other committee of Senate, exercised jurisdiction over this general area. Dean Woods asked whether the students had approached the Committee on Educational Procedures, and Mr. Hyman said that this topic was not appropriate to that committee, and that a global study was required. Professor Noumoff urged the matter not be prejudged and that the word "possible" be inserted before the word "alternatives".

Professor Horowitz said that the word "grading" was not sufficiently accurate or descriptive, and suggested that instead of "grading", words such as "the present patterns of evaluating students' progress, etc." should be substituted. Professor Johnston said he agreed, and both talked further of a possible rewording.

Professor Henry said that this was an important matter which needed study urgently, but if an appropriate committee existed the matter could be referred to it. Professor Bindra said he felt that this was not a matter to be referred to an ad hoc committee but that the question should be referred to the Steering Committee to decide.

Dean Woods said he felt that the question should be referred directly to the Academic Policy Committee. Professor Bindra then MOVED, as an amendment to the motion, that the question be referred to the Academic Policy Committee for specific consideration.

Professor Malloch said that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction over the system of evaluation, but he doubted whether a new University-wide system could ever be adopted. He suggested that the question be referred to the Faculties for their individual

consideration. Professor Widdop said he agreed with Professor Malloch that a monumental task was involved, and that he doubted whether an overall blanket system could ever be developed. Professor Pavlasek suggested that the referral should take the form of a specific directive to the Academic Policy Committee.

Mr. Caron spoke against the amendment. He said he believed that this was the most important subject introduced in Senate, and that under the normal procedures of the Academic Policy Committee it might be one and a half years before the matter was reported back again to Senate.

Professor Yates said he agreed with Professor Malloch that no one system would ever satisfy the University at large. He said he felt that the task was to study the question and to outline possible alternatives. He added that he believed the Academic Policy Committee was the proper body to which the question should be referred, and that a dis-service to a senior committee of the University would result if this was not done.

Mr. Brown then MOVED that the question be put, and this motion was carried, with three members dissenting.

The amendment was then voted upon and was carried by a vote of 34 to 10.

Mr. Grey proposed that the deadline of March 1st, 1969, be proposed to the Academic Policy Committee for reporting back on this matter, but withheld this proposal. Dean d'Ombain said he hoped that the question would be referred to Faculties at the same time that it went forward to the Committee on Academic Policy.

As an amendment to the motion, Professor Anhalt then MOVED that the following resolution be adopted:

"Be it resolved that the Senate directs the Academic Policy Committee to examine the present patterns of evaluation of student progress, examinations, and grading that are presently in use in the University, and to undertake and/or propose other courses of action it finds desirable. It is understood that the Committee will also keep in mind the essential autonomy of the different parts of the University in this regard."

Professor Anhalt spoke to his motion, and Professor Judkins pointed out that this motion included the points brought forward by Professor Malloch. Dean Cohen said he agreed with the points previously made by Professor Bindra, that the whole teaching process was involved in such a study, and that the Academic Policy Committee constituted a natural locus for such a study to be conducted.

Mr. Ellis spoke against the amendment, and asked whether the wording previously suggested by Professor Horowitz would pay due regard to the autonomy of Faculties.

After further discussion, Professor Anhalt withdrew his amendment, and the following amendment to the motion proposed by Professor Horowitz, and seconded by Professor Johnston, was MOVED:

"Be it resolved that Senate, while respecting the autonomy of Faculties and Departments, ask the Committee on Academic Policy to re-evaluate and prepare a report on the effect of the present patterns of evaluation of students' progress, examinations and grading and to propose possible alternatives to them."

This amendment to the motion was carried.

The main motion, as amended, was then carried.

In response to Mr. Grey's previous suggestion, Senate agreed that the Academic Policy Committee should be asked to present a progress report on this matter by March 15th.

106. MOTIONS ON QUEBEC EDUCATION

Mr. Hajaly prepared to introduce his "Motions on Quebec Education", and his revised "Motions" were then circulated to those who had not already received them.

On a point of privilege, Professor Yates asked that henceforth all documents submitted to Senate should be suitably dated and identified.

Mr. Hajaly reminded Senate that these motions had first been presented at the special meeting on October 18th at the height of the CEGEP crisis. On a point of order, Mr. Brown asked whether this was a question of reconsideration. Mr. Hajaly replied that the motions, as such, had never been considered by Senate and that hence this was not a matter of reconsideration.

The Principal reviewed the events that had occurred at the special meeting of Senate on October 18th. The presenters of the motion had left the meeting, leaving Senate to discuss the question alone. Senate had then adopted parallel motions of its own but did not reject the original motions. The Principal ruled, therefore, that this was not a question of reconsideration.

Mr. Hajaly said that Motion 1 was the only one to be changed in wording, and presented its new wording as follows:

"Affirms its belief that all citizens must be ensured their right of access to education (academic, professional or technical) to the extent of their abilities and interests—i.e. that financial, social, and space barriers should be eliminated by appropriate Government action and planning."

Mr. Hajaly then presented the balance of the motions as follows:

Motion 2

"Urges the government of Quebec to fulfil its long-standing promise by immediately taking concrete steps to bring about universal accessibility to education; and affirms that this cannot be achieved without provision of further educational facilities, and in particular urges that the government implement its promises to build a second French-language university in Montreal, comparable in capacity to the University of Montreal, as the first campus of the University of Quebec."

Motion 3

Urges the government of the CEGEPs to implement the principle of democratization of education, and attempt to carry out the educational reforms proposed by the students.

Motion 4

Urges the government and the Board of Directors of the CEGEPs not to adopt repressive measures against student union leaders, and specifically not to effectively expel them by holding an artificial re-admission at which time they are purposefully discriminated against.

Motion 5

Instructs the Principal to communicate the above to the Minister of Education, and instructs its representatives on all committees of the Department of Education and Superior Council of Education, such as the Comité Mixte and the University Council, to support the above policies where appropriate.

Motion 6

Establishes a committee to study the feasibility of implementing a trimester or other system at McGill in order to make the best use of existing educational facilities.

Motion 7

Urges other Quebec universities to adopt similar positions on all the above.

Mr. Hajaly then spoke to each of the motions separately, giving the rationale and reasons behind each one.

Mr. Hajaly, seconded by Mr. Hyman, then MOVED that Motion 1 be adopted.

(At this point the motion adopted by Senate at the special meeting on October 18th, 1968, was distributed.)

In discussion of Mr. Hajaly's motion, Mr. Grey proposed that the word "residents" be substituted for

the word "citizens", and this change was accepted by the mover and the seconder of the motion. It was also agreed that the last four words be changed to read "government planning and action".

Professor Frankel referred to the special meeting of Senate on October 18th, saying that the Senate motions had been passed after a lengthy debate, although there had been no campus debate of the Senate resolution and it had never been published in full in the *Daily*. The Senate motion, he believed, was as far as Senate was prepared to go at that time. A prolonged debate would be needed on the motions presented by Mr. Hajaly, and even if these motions were passed they would make no impact on Quebec and no results would be achieved. He added that there was a great deal of work to be done at today's meeting of Senate and that this work could not be done if a lengthy debate was to take place on Mr. Hajaly's motions.

Professor Leblond then MOVED that the motion be tabled because similar motions had already been passed by Senate which were acceptable to the majority of the University. Professor Leblond changed this motion with the consent of Professor Weber, the seconder, and MOVED merely that the motion be tabled.

This motion was voted upon and carried, by a vote of 23 to 15.

Mr. Hajaly rose to say that at the special meeting on October 18th Mr. Hyman had not been allowed to speak to the Senate motion before the vote had been taken. The presentation of the motion today, he said, was giving Senate one more chance. He said that it was inconceivable to him that the most important piece of legislation to come before Senate should be shelved in this way and he considered this action to be irresponsible. Mr. Foster expressed his agreement, saying that this was a railroading job and a masterpiece of evasion.

Professor Johnston said he believed the students were right in substance but that the student tactics had rebounded against their own best interests. In fairness to the Students' Society he felt the Steering Committee should be asked to arrange an educational conference, comprising students, staff, alumni and Governors which might last a week. This would be a plenary session, without hindrance of parliamentary rules, to discuss broad questions which had been first considered in committees. Seconded by Professor Pavlasek, he then MOVED a motion to this effect.

Professor Orvig expressed concern at the passing of a motion to table in this instance, and Professor Horowitz said he felt it most unfortunate that Senate had not considered the motions.

Mr. Hajaly said that the original Students' Society brief could be circulated to members of Senate once again, and then the matter could be removed from the table to be discussed and resolved.

Dean d'Ombain said he had had some doubts about Motion 1, especially with regard to financial capability and priorities, and he had also felt some doubts about Motion 4. The question now, he felt, was how to get down to realities, and he said he believed that the conference idea had merit.

Professor Leblond pointed out that this question had already received considerable discussion at the meeting on October 18th. He said he believed it was quite proper of Senate to table the matter since it had already adopted a motion which represented its position. Since the motion had been tabled he said he did not feel that the discussion should be continued.

Dean Woods said it was proper to debate Professor Johnston's motion. Professor Noumoff said he wondered why when only Motion 1 had been moved, the whole set of motions had been tabled. The Principal ruled that the whole set of motions had been presented and hence a motion to table the whole was in order. Mr. Grey referred to remarks previously made by Dean Cohen to the effect that Senate was being hampered by technicalities and said he believed it was proper to discuss the present motion.

Dean Cohen said he supported the motion moved

by Professor Johnston, saying that there was much raw material for debate on education in Quebec, and that there should be an early forum to consider the question. He wondered, however, why Mr. Hajaly's motions did not include such subjects as English-speaking rights, University financing, problems of CEGEP—University adjustment etc.

Professor Malloch raised the question of what the function of Senate was. This kind of discussion he felt, was clearly Senate's business and a conference on the subject would be an evasion. If Senate had to meet almost forever this would still be the proper way to conduct the work of the University. Professor Bindra pointed out that the function of Senate was policy and legislation. He favoured the idea of a forum, after which legislation would be brought back as the proper business of Senate.

Mr. Foster replied to the points made by Dean Cohen, saying he believed it was time to consider the rights of others and not merely our own as the English-speaking minority. Senate, he felt, was standing in the way of progress by refusing to face issues. He did not believe that another forum was needed and that the issue should be discussed by the body which was able to act, namely Senate. Senate would be causing the greatest disservice to the University if it did not discuss this issue. Mr. Grey said that perhaps Mr. Foster did not speak for all when he described what students wanted. He felt sure, for instance, that all students did not want French unilingualism.

Professor Judkins said he was disturbed by the point raised by Professor Orvig concerning the tabling of the motion and the danger that it might be permanently killed. The Principal replied that the matter could be taken from the table after the conference was held. Professor Johnston made the point that the same subject would emerge but not necessarily the same motions.

In the course of further discussion, it was established that if the conference was to be held it would take place within the second term. Professor Johnston said that he would write out a more precise motion concerning the proposed conference.

Senate then recessed for lunch at 1:45 p.m. and resumed at 2:25 p.m.

Professor Leblond MOVED that the meeting be adjourned at 5:00 p.m. As an amendment to the motion, Mr. Edel MOVED that the meeting continue for as long as was necessary, and this Amendment was lost by a vote of 19 to 17.

The motion to adjourn at 5:00 p.m. was carried by a vote of 19 to 9, it being agreed that the question of continuing after 5:00 p.m. should be reconsidered at that time.

Dean d'Ombain, seconded by Professor Malloch, then MOVED that the Motions on Quebec Education moved by Mr. Hajaly be taken from the table.

In discussion, Professor Yates and other members said they would prefer the holding of the proposed conference first. Mr. Hyman said he was opposed to the proposed Conference as a palliative measure and would only favour it if Dean d'Ombain's motion was passed.

Senate then agreed that Professor Johnston's motion could be put first. Professor Johnston, seconded by Professor Pavlasek, then MOVED that the following motion be adopted:

"Be it resolved that the Senate direct the Steering Committee, with the cooption of additional student Senators, to make arrangements for a Conference on Quebec Education viewed in the broadest terms, with every sector of the University community participating—the particular form of the Conference to be worked out in consultation with all concerned."

That the Conference take place before the end of March 1969, and that it seek to formulate specific policy recommendations for consideration by the Senate."

This motion was voted upon and carried, by a vote of 26 to 12.

Dean d'Ombraïn's motion to remove the matter from the table was then voted upon and carried by a vote of 31 to 9.

Mr. Foster said he was flabbergasted that members of Senate could have found points they were previously unaware of which caused them to change their mind. Mr. Hyman suggested that this change had been brought about through fear of possible consequence. Members disagreed strongly with this interpretation by Mr. Hyman.

Mr. Shaw said that factors unknown to him had been brought forward in the course of debate and this was what had made him change his mind; the question of threat had played no part in his decision.

Mr. Grey said that when the motions on Quebec Education were considered he wished to add a new Motion 8.

107. MOTIONS ON QUEBEC EDUCATION

Mr. Hajaly MOVED once again that Motion 1 of the "Motions on Quebec Education" be adopted.

Dean Cohen referred to the previous discussion and said that the ability of Senate to change its mind was a credit and not a demerit. He also replied to some of the points Mr. Foster had made concerning the situation of the English-speaking minority, etc. He concluded by asking what the operational consequences of Motion 1 would be as it affected the University, financially and in practical terms.

Professor Sandiford pointed out that Senate had already passed parallel resolutions, and asked in what respect the new motions were superior.

Mr. Hajaly replied that the Senate resolution was based on false assumptions. Accessibility to education had to be considered according to need, and in the last year the Government had cut down the amount of bursary assistance available to students and had increased the interest rates on loans, as well as imposing a deduction for summer earnings even if the student had been unable to obtain a summer job. This situation he considered to be a regression, adding that several countries had already abolished tuition fees and provided salaries for qualified students in need. He said he believed that fees should be reduced to nil and salaries provided when needed. He added that there were 24,000 places for English-speaking students in Quebec universities and only 27,000 for French-speaking students despite the disparity in population and said also that space barriers had to be removed. In response to a question from Professor Maître, Mr. Hajaly said that his motion pertained to all areas of post-secondary education.

Dean d'Ombraïn said he did not believe the University should try to say which priorities the Government should establish, adding that the Government might, for instance, have to give priority to the feeding and housing of people over education. As an amendment to the motion, therefore, he MOVED the following:

"Senate, believing in the principle that all residents must be ensured, to the extent of their abilities, their right of access to education (academic, professional and technical) recommends that the Government give a high priority to the elimination of financial, social and space barriers."

In discussion of this amendment Mr. Shaw said he felt the word "appropriate" in the original motion was sufficient to achieve the same purpose. Professor Leblond said he believed that the wording of Dean d'Ombraïn's motion was more precise. Professor Leblond read from a letter he had written to the *McGill Reporter* concerning post-secondary education. He made the point that the division in CEGEPs should have been three to one in favour of the technical stream, but that this proportion had in fact been reversed. Mr. Hyman added that 60% of technical graduates had not found jobs in their specialty and that this was due to a lack of economic planning.

Dean Cohen asked what Mr. Hajaly wanted to result from his motions, and Mr. Hajaly referred to Motion 5 concerning the communication of the University's adopted policies to the Minister of Educa-

tion and other bodies. Mr. Caron added that the motion only expressed a general principle which should be the general aim of a benevolent government.

On the subject of universal accessibility, Professor Bindra spoke of the experience in California where the increase in enrolment resulting from free education had largely been manifested among the middle class, thus through taxation robbing the poor to enrich the middle class. Such a subject, he said, could not be discussed without reference to national wealth. Professor Frankel spoke further in this regard.

Mr. Hamer said that the assumption of the student motion was that Quebec did, in fact, have the necessary money to bring about universal accessibility. Mr. Edel added that the University should encourage poor students to attend. He said he favoured salaries for the poor and the raising of fees for the rich.

Dean Woods made the point that the question needed a full debate, but that the University was already committed to a conference as expressed in Professor Johnston's motion, and he MOVED therefore as an amendment to the amendment to the motion that the matter be tabled until this conference had taken place. On vote this motion was lost.

Dean Cohen said he felt that Senate was in an impossible dilemma. After one and one quarter hours of debate the surface of the subject had only been scratched. He doubted whether it was possible to take a positive stand on all the implications of the issue.

Dean McGregor spoke in favour of Dean d'Ombraïn's amendment, saying that in effect it formed an introductory statement, rather like hoisting a flag. Professor Noumoff said he hoped that the Government would operationalize the principle expressed.

Dean d'Ombraïn suggested that his amendment be taken as a heading or preamble for the other motions which would follow. Professor Johnston and Dean Cohen expressed doubts that the other motions were necessarily connected to this preamble.

Professor Johnston MOVED that the question be put, and this motion was carried.

The amendment to the motion, it being understood that it would serve as a preamble to the other motions, was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 34 to 2.

The original motion, as amended, was then voted upon and carried. Professor Hitschfeld expressed the view that Senate's original motion of October 18th was clearer than the one just adopted.

Mr. Caron MOVED that the former Motion 2 (now Motion 1) be adopted.

On a point of information, Professor Frankel asked whether there were in fact "long standing promises" by the Government, saying he was not aware of any such. Mr. Hyman replied that the present Government did make such promises in order to have the UGEQ participate with the Comité de Plan. Professor Frankel and Dean Woods made the point that it was essential to identify and document any such promise or agreements in order not to appear ridiculous.

Professor Pavlasek said the University had to be careful in telling the Government its feelings about the University of Quebec. Much planning had been done to bring the first campus into being and the University should look carefully at all available planning documents before expressing an opinion. Professor Frankel agreed, saying it was essential to have all available information. He added that in committees he had served on and in surveys it had been said that the existing universities had the capacity to enroll the full output of CEGEP graduates.

Mr. Hajaly then read from a document giving facts and figures concerning enrolment and resources of the new university. In essence, he said the new university would enrol only 4400 students, the number presently enrolled in the various institutions which would be amalgamated to form the University.

Professor Pavlasek said he believed that Mr. Hajaly had read from a privileged document which it was improper for Senate to receive, and suggested that

Senate should move into confidential session if debate on such topics was to be continued. The Principal said that he did not feel that the facts and figures presented by Mr. Hajaly were necessary in reaching a decision on the principle of the Motion. Dean Woods said that he did not believe the document in question should be before Senate and asked that it be withdrawn, with the press present asked not to publish any of the information which had been read from it. The Principal said he felt that Senate should avoid being critical on this question, and also asked that the press not publish the information that had been revealed.

Professor Pavlasek said he believed this to be a negative and unhelpful motion and asked whether the movers of the motion could be less critical and propose something more positive and helpful. Mr. Hajaly replied that the motion did try to be helpful and that the Government seemed oblivious of the fact that there were not enough university places to accommodate the CEGEP graduates. He felt it was necessary for the Government to reconsider its allocation of resources in order to meet the obligations it had incurred in setting up the CEGEPs.

Professor Leblond made the point that in the history of the world no government had done more in the last twelve years than the Government of Quebec in providing aid to education. He said he felt it would be wrong to criticize the Government in the face of the vast efforts that had been made. He said that, as suggested by Professor Pavlasek, the University should say that it welcomed the Government's efforts and hoped these efforts would be continued, and that the University itself was anxious to be of help.

Mr. Shaw said he agreed with the opinion expressed by many members that the University should try to be encouraging rather than critical. As an amendment to the motion he then MOVED that the following resolution be adopted:

"While recognizing the planning, financial, and physical problems involved, Senate urges the Government of Quebec to even further expedite steps towards bringing about the universal accessibility of education, and to achieve this end expedite the construction of a major integrated campus of the University of Quebec in Montreal. To this end McGill University offers its full cooperation."

Mr. Hyman referred to Professor Frankel's comment about a survey showing there was sufficient space in existing universities to absorb CEGEP graduates, and spoke about the general unreliability of such surveys. In response to his question, Vice-Principal Winkler said a government survey showed that McGill supposedly could accommodate 20% more students.

Professor Horowitz spoke in favour of Mr. Shaw's amendment. Mr. Grey said he was worried about praising the Government since there was a great deal more the Government could do to produce revenue through taxation of churches, etc. Mr. Foster said he agreed that this was a very mild motion and that the Government had in fact done little. Professor Pavlasek reiterated that full facts and information were needed before the University could take a stand. Mr. Edel said that if Senate did not have the facts it could not pass Mr. Shaw's amendment, and MOVED that the amendment to the motion be tabled.

The Principal asked what facts could be procured, and Mr. Caron suggested that the needs of students had to be determined as well as Government plans to meet these needs. Dean Cohen again expressed reservations about Senate making a serious judgment of substance without sufficient knowledge and information. Dean Cohen then gave notice of motion that he would move at the next meeting that a Committee on External Policy be established. Such a committee would undertake studies and provide information in depth and detail which was lacking in the open forum of Senate. In the meantime, he felt that the whole question on the floor of Senate should be tabled.

Professor Noumoff suggested that when the re-

quired information was obtained it should be circulated as widely as possible to Faculties and Divisions. Mr. Shaw said he doubted whether the requisite information could be obtained in the near future, and hence that the matter might be tabled permanently. Mr. Hajaly said that he agreed with Mr. Shaw, adding that the urgency of the situation was that only 6,500 university places existed for 13,000 CEGEP students.

The motion to table the amendment was then voted upon and was lost by a vote of 15 to 13.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 21 to 5.

Debate on the main motion, as amended, continued. Mr. Hyman read the third recommendation adopted by Senate at its special meeting on October 18th, and said the present motion merely said the same thing again. Professor Horowitz said that the present statement did go further than the October 18th statement and Professor Pavlasek added that the present statement was substantive and offered the University's help.

After further discussion Dean Dion MOVED that the question be put, and this motion was carried.

The main motion, as amended, was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 22 to 6.

Reference was made to the motion passed earlier in the meeting to adjourn at 5:00 p.m., it then being 5:15 p.m. Dean Dion MOVED that the meeting adjourn, and this motion was carried, with five members dissenting.

Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Senate minutes

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF SENATE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22ND, 1969, AT 3:10 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL ROOM OF THE LEACOCK BUILDING.

108. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Vice-Principal Oliver MOVED that the agenda be adopted.

As an amendment to the motion, Mr. Grey MOVED that agenda item C II c), his motion to appoint a Committee to inform High School students, be moved to the top of the agenda. Mr. Grey outlined the discussions which had taken place on this subject with the Registrar, the Schools Liaison Officer, and the Director of the Admissions Office, saying that it was urgent to have this Committee appointed in the near future.

This amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried.

As an amendment to the motion Dean Cohen MOVED that agenda item D d), his motion to establish a Committee on External University Policies and Relations be moved to second place on the agenda. Dean Cohen explained that this amendment might facilitate dealing with today's agenda. Professor Leblond and Mr. Hyman expressed reservations, and in response to Mr. Hyman's question Dean Cohen said that adoption of the amendment would not prejudice the question of referring any of the motions on Quebec education to this committee. The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 25 to 7.

Mr. Grey gave notice of motion that he would move that the nature of Convocation should be changed in the future.

The motion to adopt the agenda, as amended, was then voted upon and carried.

109. REPORT OF STEERING COMMITTEE

The Principal presented the following report of the Steering Committee:

1. *Future procedures to expedite going through the agenda:*

The Steering Committee has considered the proposals of Professor Yates and Professor Sandiford about

dealing with the agenda, and has developed some ideas of its own. A sub-committee is preparing a report on this subject which will be presented at the next meeting of Senate.

2. Adoption of minutes:

Under Senate rules, no minutes should be published or circulated until they have been approved, and on general principle the Committee considers it highly undesirable to accumulate a backlog of unapproved Minutes.

It is recommended therefore that the following minutes of meetings be presented herewith for adoption, it being clearly understood, however, that discussion of any business arising from these minutes will take place at the appropriate place in the agenda at this or future meetings:

- Minutes of the special meeting held on November 11th, 1968.
- Minutes of the regular meeting held on November 20th, 1968.
- Minutes of the resumed meeting held on December 10th, 1968.
- Minutes of the regular meeting held on December 18th, 1968.

3. Future structure of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research:

Recognizing that many divergent proposals and opinions have been brought forward since the Yaffe report was presented to Senate, and that Senate as a whole would have great difficulty in evaluating the merits or demerits of the various proposals, the Committee recommends that the question now be referred to the Committee on Academic Policy as a matter for immediate attention, with that Committee asked to study all the proposals and present a recommendation to Senate.

4. Future meetings:

It is still proposed that Senate should meet on every second Wednesday for the balance of the session. Some conflicts in dates have arisen, however, and the Steering Committee will propose firm dates later. At least one meeting will be scheduled to take place at Macdonald College.

5. Conference on Quebec Education:

The Committee reports that it intends to appoint a sub-committee to consider how and when this Conference should be held.

6. Management Board of the Gault Estate:

The report of the Nominating Committee, pending before Senate, is concerned solely with the composition of the Management Board of the Gault Estate. It is recommended therefore that the proposal of the Nominating Committee be approved and that the following be appointed to constitute the Management Board of the Gault Estate:

Emeritus Professor F. S. Howes, Chairman;
Professors M. J. Dunbar, P. F. Maycock, C. W. Stearn, H. H. Yates, One student member, The Manager, attending.

7. Statutory Selection Committees:

It is recommended that the following be appointed the representatives of Senate on statutory selection committees:

- for a Chair in Marine Sciences:
Professors M. J. Dunbar and E. R. Pounder, with Dean Woods and Frost, Vice-Principal Winkler, Vice-Principal Oliver, the Principal, ex officio.
- for a Chair in the Graduate School of Library Science:
Professors D. E. Woodsworth and Virginia Murray, with Dean Frost, Vice-Principal Winkler, Vice-Principal Oliver, the Principal, ex officio.
- for a Chair in Philosophy:
Professors H. Bracken and G. Johnston, with Deans Woods and Frost, Vice-Principal Winkler, Vice-Principal Oliver, the Principal, ex officio.

Items 1, 4 and 5 of the report, dealing respectively with Future Procedures to Expedite Going Through the Agenda; Future Meetings; and Conference on Quebec Education, were received for information. With regard to item 4, it was pointed out that the conflicts in dates for future meetings had been resolved and that Senate would, therefore, meet henceforth on every second Wednesday, the next meeting to be held on February 5th, 1969.

On motions duly seconded, it was resolved that item 2 be approved, and that the Minutes of the meetings held on November 11th, 1968, November 20th, 1968, December 10th, 1968, and December 18th, 1968, be adopted.

Three amendments were noted in the minutes of the meeting held on November 20th, and one amendment in the minutes of the meeting held on December 18th. These amendments being duly noted, the minutes of these four meetings, as amended, were adopted.

Professor Bindra MOVED that item 3, the proposal that the question of the future structure of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research be referred to the Committee on Academic Policy, be adopted.

Mr. Hyman asked whether further documents on this subject should be forwarded to Senate or to the Academic Policy Committee. Professor Bindra suggested that any new proposals should be forwarded to the Steering Committee which would decide whether these should be forwarded to the Academic Policy Committee or to Senate as a whole. Professor Yaffe asked that any new documents should also be forwarded to members of his original Senate committee.

The motion to approve the recommendation contained in item 3 was then voted upon and carried.

Mr. Hyman MOVED that meetings of Senate should henceforth commence at 2:10 p.m. rather than at 3:10 p.m.

Professor Yaffe suggested that because of the inadequate elevator system in the Leacock Building meetings should begin either before or after 2:10 p.m. At this point the Principal cautioned members of the audience about making audible comments while a member of Senate was speaking. Professor Yaffe then suggested that meetings should commence at 2:20 p.m., and Mr. Hyman said he would agree to this change. The motion to commence Senate meetings henceforth at 2:20 p.m. was then voted upon and carried.

Vice-Principal Winkler MOVED that item 6 of the report, recommending the composition of the Management Board of the Gault Estate, be adopted, and this motion was carried.

Professor Bindra MOVED that item 7 of the report, recommending the appointment of statutory selection committees, be adopted.

Mr. Foster pointed out that motions at previous meetings concerned with representation on committees had been tabled until after January 31st while awaiting the report from the MAUT. He felt it was logical to delay these recommendations in a similar way, and then MOVED that they be tabled.

This motion was voted upon and was lost.

The motion to approve the appointment of the three proposed statutory selection committees was then voted upon and carried, with three members dissenting.

110. INFORMING HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. Grey MOVED that the following motion be adopted:

"Be it MOVED that as soon as plans for a five-year programme are finally crystallized, the Senate set up a committee made up of staff members and students to inform High School students about the new system, to discuss it with them, and to report their reactions to Senate."

Mr. Grey again spoke to his motion, stressing that inasmuch as the closing date for applications was

March 1st the work of this committee would largely have to be accomplished during the month of February.

Professor Leblond and Professor Anhalt spoke in support of the motion. Professor Anhalt said he felt it was important to involve the Faculties and the Schools Liaison Officer in this programme, and then MOVED the following Amendment to the Motion:

"Be it resolved that as soon as plans for the five-year programme are crystallized, the Senate set up a committee with membership representative of the various Faculties and segments of the University, with the function to guide, and aid, the Schools Liaison Officer in the task of communication with High School students, teachers and administrators about the new programme."

In discussion, Mr. Grey said he thought that this amendment could be incorporated into his own motion. Professor Ferguson asked whether this work was not now in any event being carried out by the University Admissions Committee and the Admissions Office, and it was suggested that the task of communicating information would be an amplification of the existing work that was being done.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried.

111. EXTERNAL POLICIES

Dean Cohen MOVED that the following motion be adopted:

"Be it resolved that Senate establish a standing committee on External University Policies and Relations to which would be sent all questions touching the relations of the University to the general community, government (at all levels), and other related activities; said Committee to co-ordinate its activities with those of the Academic Policy Committee and to provide the means to study, on behalf of Senate all such questions presented to Senate and reporting back its findings and recommendations to Senate accordingly."

Dean Cohen spoke to his motion; and the Principal for the second time cautioned members of the audience against making audible interventions.

In discussion, Dean Jay questioned the referring of "all" questions, and Dean Cohen said he would accept the use of the word "normally" in this context. Professor Pavlasek made the observation that Mr. Ellis's motion, still to be dealt with, concerning proposals to Quebec, could almost form part of Dean Cohen's motion and Vice-Principal Oliver pointed out that the one dealt with "ideas" and the other with "proposals".

Professor Metrakos asked whether there was an existing committee to which such questions could be referred, and asked also how the work of the proposed committee would be coordinated with that of the Academic Policy Committee. Dean Cohen replied that the proposed committee would have terms of reference which did not at the moment exist elsewhere. He agreed that at times the work of the proposed committee and the Committee on Academic Policy would overlap. In response to a question from Professor Noumoff, Dean Cohen explained what was meant by the phrase "other related activities".

Mr. Foster said that in his opinion the proposed committee would serve the same purpose as the Tripartite Commission, namely to keep the heat off, and the issues would come back eventually to Senate. He said he believed this was political tactics on Dean Cohen's part and represented an attempt to keep the majority from discussing issues.

On a point of privilege Dean Cohen said it was improper of Mr. Foster to raise the question of his motives, and Professor Yaffe added that according to Robert's *Rules of Order* motives should never be imputed. Mr. Foster went on to say that the motion could be used as a mechanism to prevent discussion of the motion concerning the present teachers' contract dispute.

There was further disturbance from the audience,

and Professor Yaffe, seconded by Professor Leblond, MOVED that the gallery be cleared.

Mr. Grey said he agreed that the behaviour of the audience was improper, but that the interruptions so far were not sufficiently severe to justify this step. Mr. Hajaly then MOVED that the question be put, and this motion was carried. The motion to clear the gallery was then voted upon and was lost.

Mr. Grey said that he wished to hear Mr. Raymond Laliberté, the President of the Corporation des Enseignants de Québec, address Senate today and suggested that no more time be spent in this discussion. He said he favoured the appointment of this committee since it would provide a useful way of avoiding road-blocks in Senate. Mr. Ellis also spoke in support of the motion, as did Professor Anhalt, stressing that intelligent documentation would frequently be needed before discussion of external issues.

As an Amendment to the Motion, Professor Wallace then MOVED that Dean Cohen's motion be re-phrased as follows:

"Be it resolved that Senate establish a standing committee on External University Policies and Relations to consider questions touching relations of the University to the general community, government (at all levels), and other related activities; said committee to coordinate its activities with those of the Academic Policy Committee."

In discussion, Professor Metrakos wondered whether the amendment would defeat the purpose of the motion, and Dean Cohen said he did not think so since the committee in any event would possess no executive powers and would have to report back to Senate. Professor Horowitz spoke in favour of the amendment but said he was opposed to sending any of the motions on Quebec Education to this committee.

The amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried. The main motion, as amended, was then voted upon and carried, with four members dissenting.

Professor Noumoff inquired about the ability of Senate to lift an issue from a committee which had been referred to it by the Steering Committee, and the Principal replied that Senate had power to do this at any time.

112. MOTIONS ON QUEBEC EDUCATION

Mr. Hajaly asked Senate's consent to depart from the regular order of resuming the presentation of the motions on Quebec Education, and proposed instead that the additional motion, which had been circulated, be considered first. As reasons for this proposal Mr. Hajaly said that a pressing situation was developing with rotating strikes of teachers about to commence; that the quality of secondary education was a matter of overriding importance to the University; and that, lastly, Mr. Raymond Laliberté, the President of the CEQ, had been invited by the Students' Society to visit the University today with the hope that he would address Senate. Mr. Hajaly added that a government representative had also been invited, but that this invitation had been declined.

Professor Yaffe pointed out that Mr. Hajaly's proposal was contrary to the adopted agenda, and the Principal ruled that the proposal must first be heard before Senate could decide whether or not it should be considered.

Mr. Hajaly then read the following motion and MOVED that it be adopted:

Be it resolved that the Senate of McGill University:

External Position.

a) commend the Quebec teachers' unions (CEQ, PAPT and PACT) for progressing beyond wage and security demands in posing a counter-model for educational reform and professional improvement which goes much further than that of the government towards meeting social and human needs;

b) urge the government to accede to the position of the unions with regard to teacher participation

in decision-making in the schools (as specified on pages 8 and 9 of the circulated document ("Négociation Provinciale"));

Internal actions

c) suggest to the Faculty of Education that it utilize class time for study and discussion of the collective agreements being proposed by the two parties;

d) encourage members of the University to work with the unions, both by developing curricula and carrying out research, in such a way as to further define and advance the unions' aims of educational reform, professional upgrading and democratisation;

e) instruct the University Scholarships Committee to report to Senate on the possibility of using scholarship funds to aid participants studying at the University under teacher-improvement programmes.

Vice-Principal Oliver said he objected to consideration of this motion. No notice of motion had been given, and he felt also that the procedure had been engineered as a challenge to Senate. He said that the motion of inviting a distinguished public personage such as M. Laliberté to wait in the University Centre while the question of his speaking to Senate was being discussed was blackmail. Mr. Foster said it was now Vice-Principal Oliver who was imputing motives, and Vice-Principal Oliver said that he was merely presenting his own opinion and judgment. Vice-Principal Oliver went on to say that he was not prejudging the merits or demerits of the motion, but begged Senate not to consider it and not to be bulldozed merely because of the embarrassment of M. Laliberté's presence. He urged that the order of Senate business be continued with, and MOVED objection to consideration of the question.

Mr. Grey said that everyone had high respect for M. Laliberté. He felt, however, that Senate was discussing the question of Quebec Education and feelings of discontent should not prevent Senate from hearing M. Laliberté. The way in which he had been invited was perhaps inappropriate and improper, but he felt that he should be heard, and that such action would not present a surrender.

In response to a question from Professor Leblond, the Principal said that Mr. Laliberté had not been invited by the Chairman or Secretary to address Senate. Mr. Hyman explained that he had been the person who had got in touch with M. Laliberté. He cited the precedent of the representative of the High School Students' Councils who had been invited to address Senate. The invitation to M. Laliberté was not a ruse, but a technique for providing information to Senate. He added that a government representative had also been invited to address Senate.

Professor Horowitz said he disagreed with Vice-Principal Oliver and considered the motion to be a very urgent matter of University business. He said he favoured positive action and that the question of M. Laliberté could be dealt with after the motion had been considered. Mr. Hajaly said he took exception to Vice-Principal Oliver's remarks. No blackmail had been intended, and the question of the quality of students coming from the secondary system affected the quality of University education itself. He said he hated to think that Senate would not consider this matter as its legitimate business.

Dean Jay said it would be wrong to hear one side of an issue in the public arena without hearing the other, and was supported in this viewpoint by Professor Bates. Professor Leblond suggested that both M. Laliberté and a representative of the government be invited to address the forthcoming Conference on Education, and that Senate should vote on the question and proceed with its business. Professor Henry said that a ruling on this question of invitations to outside persons was needed so that the same situation would not occur in the future.

Speaking in response to Vice-Principal Oliver, Mr. Foster said he agreed that a challenge had been is-

sued and he hated to think that the University would not take it up. Mr. Ellis made the point that although the motion itself had not been presented at the last meeting of the Steering Committee, notice of motion had been given that such a motion would be forthcoming. He said that if M. Laliberté was not invited to speak it was the University and Senate which would receive the black eye. The precedent of outside speakers had already been set, he said, and added that Senate could reject the motion but still allow Mr. Laliberté to speak. He urged Senate to receive and discuss the motion and to take a position.

At the Principal's request Vice-Principal Winkler took the Chair, and the Principal then presented his views to Senate. The Principal said, first, there was the practical aspect with regard to the motions on Quebec Education. Senate had already devoted a special meeting to this topic on October 18th, 1968, and the question had been discussed at subsequent meetings for many hours. On the matter of principle, the fundamental question, he felt, was whether Senate should debate public issues of this kind that were not of immediate and main concern to the University. He said that the main purpose of Senate was to deal with the academic business of the University, and that Senate should involve itself in matters in which it had competence and where it was prepared to devote the necessary time and study after which sound decisions could be made and pronouncements issued which would have real value. If Senate should decide to take up matters of public interest and study them fully in committee, or in some other way, and then finally take a position there would be nothing wrong with this in principle, but Senate should not by doing so, he felt, neglect its proper business. He concluded by saying he believed that Senate was not neglecting its proper duties and said he supported the motion objecting to consideration of the question.

As an amendment to the motion, Dean Dion MOVED that the motion be referred to the MAUT and the Students' Society for their action, but the Principal pointed out that an amendment to this particular motion was out of order.

The discussion continued at greater length, with several members expressing their views. Vice-Principal Oliver pointed out that his objection was to consideration of this item on the agenda, and not to the question of hearing M. Laliberté. If Senate adopted his motion, Senate would still be free to decide on this latter question. Mr. Foster said that in his opinion the concept that the University's own business must be dealt with first might have been applicable 100 years ago but was not today. He urged that Senate recognize this issue to be of primary importance. Professor Yaffe then MOVED that the question be put, and this motion was carried.

The motion objecting to consideration of the question was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 29 to 11.

Vice-Principal Oliver then MOVED that M. Laliberté be invited to address Senate briefly.

Professor Yaffe rose, and disturbance from the audience prevented him from presenting an amendment to the motion. Professor Yaffe then MOVED that the gallery be cleared.

Mr. Ellis said he believed that speakers should not purposely antagonize the gallery.

Dean Cohen said he feared that Senate was on the brink of a tragedy. The University now had the most advanced charter in Canada. He himself had welcomed the coming of students to Senate and the idea of open meetings. He said he believed that the entire University community had a stake in making the system work. He begged all concerned not to allow such a position to be reached that the gallery had to be cleared.

Professor Horowitz said he would be most unhappy if this motion was passed. He felt it was wrong to punish all for the actions of some. He urged that the motion be defeated and an appeal made to the audience. Dean d'Ombraim pointed out that a number of

such appeals had already been made, and MOVED as an amendment to the motion that if any further interference from the audience should occur, the extent of the interference to be judged by the Chair, the gallery be cleared. Professor Yaffe accepted this amendment to the motion and withdrew his own.

The Principal referred to the points made by Dean Cohen, Mr. Ellis and Professor Horowitz, saying it was understandable that in the excitement of the moment the audience might be carried away and express applause. He added, however, that hissing and cat-calls simply could not be tolerated, and the audience had already been warned repeatedly.

Professor Noumoff said that at each meeting a juncture was reached where members entered into a polemic. He spoke against a mechanical response, such as the amendment, and suggested that Senate should attempt to proceed working according to reason and recognizing the new environment in which it existed.

After further discussion, Vice-Principal Oliver pointed out that the motion only reiterated a rule adopted by Senate. He felt that the motion should be withdrawn and the existing rule remain in force. Professor Yaffe said he too hoped that it would not be necessary to clear the gallery and withdrew his motion.

Discussion of Vice-Principal Oliver's motion to invite M. Laliberté to address Senate continued. As an amendment to the motion, Professor Yaffe MOVED that the words "without this being considered a precedent" be added to Vice-Principal Oliver's motion.

Professor Leblond spoke against the motion and the amendment. He said that M. Laliberté had not been invited by Senate to address Senate, and proposed again that M. Laliberté and a representative of the government be asked to participate in the forthcoming Conference on Quebec Education.

Discussion continued, in which it was asked whether M. Laliberté had actually been invited to address Senate. Vice-Principal Oliver made the point that M. Laliberté had been led to believe that he would speak to Senate, and he felt it was improper to give the impression now that Senate was not willing to hear him. Because a mistake had been made was not a sufficient reason to refuse to hear a distinguished citizen who had been invited to the University. Mr. Foster said that in his opinion this would merely be a token gesture since the motion itself had already been voted out. Professor Henry said she believed it would be a discourtesy to invite M. Laliberté after all the discussion and in view of the mood of hostility which had developed. Dean Blume suggested that Senate could adjourn to the University Centre to hear M. Laliberté speak there.

Dean d'Ombraim said it was a matter of courtesy to hear M. Laliberté and said he rejected the views put forward by Mr. Foster.

Professor Yaffe's Amendment to the Motion, to add the words "without this being considered a precedent", was then voted upon and carried.

The main motion, as amended, to invite M. Laliberté to address Senate, was then voted upon and carried, by a vote of 25 to 18.

Pending the arrival of M. Laliberté, the Principal asked for discussion concerning procedures with regard to invitations being issued to outside persons to address Senate.

It was then MOVED by Dean d'Ombraim that no external person should ever be asked to address Senate without the proposal having been approved at a meeting of Senate or of the Steering Committee. Professor Noumoff proposed that whenever the Steering Committee rejected a proposal that a person be invited to address Senate it should give its reasons and justification. Dean d'Ombraim said he assumed such a provision would automatically apply, and the Principal added that the Steering Committee would be bound to take such action.

Mr. Hyman made the point that it would not always be known when urgent information from an outside person would be needed, and Dean Cohen replied that Senate was not a grand jury or concerned with instantaneous crises and issues. Mr. Hyman said he

rejected the implication that attitudes of crises were being taken when they did not exist.

Dean d'Ombraim's amendment to the motion was then voted upon and carried, with five members dissenting.

Dean d'Ombraim MOVED that the meeting adjourn at 6:30 p.m., and this motion was carried.

At this point M. Raymond Laliberté, President of the CEQ, entered the meeting, and was introduced by the Principal.

M. Laliberté spoke briefly, thanking Senate for receiving him and saying he realized the difficulties his presence on the campus had caused today. He said that the problem he had to speak on was an important one and was one which was too seldom discussed at university levels. He regretted, however, the way in which his invitation to address Senate had been forced, adding that the problem needed to be discussed in a positive way and the present atmosphere was not the best for this purpose. He expressed his thanks to Senate and suggested that the problem be discussed on another occasion.

M. Laliberté was thanked by Vice-Principal Oliver and then left the meeting.

At this point Senate recessed for fifteen minutes.

113. AREAS OF COMPETENCE

Professor Noumoff rose on a point of privilege and said he deplored the enormous amount of time and effort which had gone into dealing with one item of the agenda and the perpetual struggle which occurred in this regard at each meeting. He then MOVED that the Steering Committee be instructed to place as the first item on the agenda of the next meeting a discussion to define the areas of competence of Senate, to establish a framework of concern for Senate, to determine what matters belonged in Senate and what matters did not. Professor Wallace seconded the motion, saying that this problem of competence had to be settled.

Professor Leblond said he felt this was too broad a topic for discussion by the full Senate, and Mr. Hamer replied that no committee could decide for Senate what its business was.

As an amendment to the motion, Professor Maître MOVED that a special conference of Senate, lasting three or four hours, be held on this topic. At this conference there would be no voting and a series of speakers would be limited to ten minutes in which to present their ideas. He agreed with Dean Cohen's interpretation that this would be a special meeting of Senate with the agenda confined to discussion of the one topic.

Mr. Hajaly said that it would not be sufficient to confine the discussion to the question of Senate's competence since the social role of the University was involved and political and social problems would also have to be defined.

Professor Orvig spoke against both the motion and the amendment. He felt that the conference would merely result in another four hours of wasted debate. He suggested instead that Senate should go ahead slowly and surely with its work and work its way through the agenda. Professor Bindra said that the University must constantly redefine its relations with society, and added that no single ideological solution could ever result from the proposed conference. Mr. Grey urged that Senate try to formulate something and at least set down basic criteria concerning its competence. Professor Horowitz expressed agreement with Professor Orvig, saying the time at the proposed conference would be poorly spent. Referring to the stalemate at today's meeting, he said that Senate's difficulty was not in its inability to define, and that in due time necessary definitions would emerge.

Professor Leblond supported Professor Maître's amendment, saying that the nature and role of Senate needed to be discussed. He urged, however, that the special meeting should not supplant a regular meeting so that the work of Senate would not be slowed

down. Professor Anhalt also spoke in favour of the amendment, saying that Senate should not consider itself one homogeneous body, but should hold various types of different meetings from time to time. The Principal pointed out that the Steering Committee was at present considering proposals of this kind whereby Senate would divide its work into two categories: that of matters requiring executive action on Senate business (Faculty reports; Senate Committee recommendations) and that of matters primarily requiring discussion.

Professor Maître said that students should not think of the University as a political action group, and read from an article by Sidney Hook expressing this viewpoint.

Dean d'Ombain said he would abstain from voting on both the motion and the amendment. The primary business of Senate, he felt, was to deal with matters brought forward by Faculties and the Academic Policy Committee, and he hoped that the report of the Steering Committee would recommend that at each meeting, after the agenda was adopted, reports from Faculties and the Academic Policy Committee be dealt with first.

Professor Wallace said that in seconding the motion he had not considered that a consensus would emerge from the conference. He had hoped, however, that those committed to the new idea of the University would present their ideas and try to convince members of their validity. Replying to remarks from Professor Maître, Mr. Edel said that every part of society was a political action group; the only question was in which direction it was going to be active. The University itself was a political action group, and this fact was only now coming to the consciousness of Senate. Members of Senate questioned this assumption, and Mr. Edel spoke further to the matter. He agreed that the proposed conference would be useful, although no consensus would emerge.

Mr. Ellis said he believed the idea of the conference was good but that the timing was not. He referred to the last meeting of Senate when the decision to table the motions on Quebec Education had been reversed, and said that Senate was moving rapidly in a more liberal direction and dealing with questions outside the academic community. Senate was moving so fast that it was not sure where it was going. He suggested that it would be better to regulate Senate's position after the direction in which it was going had been determined.

Vice-Principal Oliver said he believed that both the motion and the amendment had merit and as a result of such a discussion Senate would understand its difficulties more thoroughly, and ways of acting together in areas where there was consensus might emerge. Judging from the experience of the Tripartite Commission, however, he felt that the debate would be endless and far-ranging. The Tripartite Commission had already discussed this and related topics at length, and he suggested that it now be asked to prepare a series of position papers to serve as an outline for the proposed conference. Dean Cohen suggested that the forthcoming Conference on Education could serve as a forum in which to discuss the question of Senate's competence.

The Principal summarized the alternatives open to Senate, and Professor Noumoff said he favoured his own motion because the question was one of immediacy and that Senate had to be able to maximise the use of its time. He said he agreed that the Tripartite Commission could provide useful notes taken from previous position papers to form the basis for discussion. Dean Cohen said that the special meeting proposed by Professor Maître could be held at a very early date, and Professor Noumoff said that if such should be the case he would agree with the proposal.

After further discussion, it was agreed that the sense of Professor Maître's amendment was that a special meeting of Senate should be held as quickly as possible to discuss the competence of Senate, with appropriate position papers being provided by the Tripartite Commission.

With this understanding, Professor Noumoff withdrew his motion, and Professor Maître's motion was then voted upon and carried, with one member dissenting.

Senate adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Minutes standing committee on communications

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY,
JANUARY 29, 1969. OPENING REMARKS.

As Vice-Principal Shaw had been called away to an important meeting on student housing, Mr. Tunis occupied the chair, and he opened the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

It was *moved* by Mr. Hyman, *seconded* by Mr. Wood that the proposed agenda be amended to include an additional item dealing with CEGEPs information. *Carried.*

ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 1968

It was *moved* by Mr. Hallward, *seconded* by Dr. Waldron that the minutes of the meeting of December 4, 1968 be adopted as circulated. *Carried.*

BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Mr. Tunis referred the Committee to the Recommendations of Senate Committee on Communication of Information, and called on reports as follows:

13. *Article and notice re Reporter in McGill News*
Re Minute 1—Mr. Tunis referred the meeting to Mr. Allen's letter of January 14, 1969 which reads in part as follows:

"It was impossible to include anything in the January issue of the McGill News and it was decided that, rather than cover the matter in the March issue very late in the academic year, detailed reference should be made to the first year's operation of the Reporter in the July issue. This would seem to be the most appropriate issue to arouse the interest of graduates who could then write for a year's subscription starting at the beginning of the 1969/1970 academic year." (Action by E. A. Allen)

14. *Availability of reports and minutes of committees*
Re Minute 2—Mr. Tunis referred the meeting to a letter received from Mr. K. Crouch, Director of Libraries, specifying where Senate minutes and reports would be available.

Mr. Tunis also referred the meeting to a motion passed by this Committee at its meeting of December 4, 1968 and pointed out that this motion had been listed on the Agenda of Senate but had not yet been considered. He then read the letter he had written to the Secretary of Senate asking him to consider this motion as a notice of motion to reconsider. (Referred to Senate)

15. McGill Daily on Macdonald Campus

Re Minute 3—Mr. Hyman reported that there was interest and that it was only a question of knowing whether or not they could afford it. It would cost \$10.00 per thousand copies for the printing plus transportation. Mr. Tunis was requested to look into the problem of transportation of the Daily with the mail room and to report back to the Committee at its next meeting. (A.A. Tunis)

16. University diary

Re Minute 5—Mr. Tunis referred the meeting to his memo to Mr. Ramsay and stated that he was awaiting the decision of the Bookstore Committee before pursuing the matter further. He said that in conversation with Mr. Ramsay the latter expressed confidence in the project and suggested the pending approval of his Committee, the Bookstore would undertake the details of finance and production. (A.A. Tunis)

17. Telephone and staff directories

Re Minute 6—Mr. Tunis showed the meeting a dummy of a combined staff and telephone directory, to afford an idea of the size of the proposed directory. It was becoming more and more evident that the project was feasible, he said, but there were still a few problems, including cost, to work out. He asked the Committee to refer this item to the next meeting, when Mr. Shaw would present the Committee with a definitive proposal. This was received positively and enthusiastically. (R.F. Shaw)

18. Annual report

Re Minute 7—Mr. Shaw has discussed the matter with the Principal who has given his approval to the Committee's recommendation for a stream-lined Annual Report and a dummy is now being prepared by the Information Office. He pointed out that the suggestions made before had been taken into consideration. A report will be submitted to the Committee at an early date. (A.A. Tunis)

19. Letter to Dr. R. E. Bell

Re Minute 10—Mr. Tunis read to the meeting his letter to Dr. Bell. This concerned a suggestion by Dr. Bell to publish the Gazette in the form of mimeographed sheets, one sheet per item. As the question of the Gazette was to be discussed under another item on the agenda, discussion was held over.

20. Statement on Editorial Policy, McGill Reporter

Re Minute 11—Mr. Thomas referred the Committee to the Statement of Editorial Policy circulated at the meeting. A lengthy discussion followed before the following two motions were passed:

1. Gazette

Moved by Mr. Hyman, *seconded* by Mr. Hallward: Be it resolved that this Committee recommend to the Information Office that the Gazette section of the Reporter be published at least every week; that it include as many of the minutes and/or actions of the Board of Governors, Senate, Faculties and Departments and their committees as it is possible to obtain; and that the staff of the Information Office actively endeavour to obtain such material from the bodies concerned. (Passed unanimously)

2. Availability of minutes and actions of University bodies

Moved by Mr. Hyman, *seconded* by Mr. Ryan: In line with Senate's affirmation of the principle "that information regarding the University and its activities should be normally regarded as public information" the Standing Committee on Communications hereby makes the following recommendation to Senate:

That Senate encourage the Board of Governors, Faculties and Departments to make available their minutes and actions and those of their committees to the Information Office as soon as possible after meetings are held, except for portions recording discussion declared confidential. (Passed unanimously. Refer to Senate)

21. Editorial Board, McGill Reporter

Re Minute 12—This matter was again very briefly discussed. Mr. Wood stated he was completely against such an editorial board and had support from all the other members of the Committee. The question was, therefore, dropped.

22. New cover for University announcements

Mr. Tunis read the meeting a letter received from the Assistant Registrar presenting the pros and cons of abandoning our present announcement covers in favour of covers like those used this year for the Announcement of the Preparatory School of Music. This change would represent an additional expenditure of \$1,840.00. The Committee felt that it was more concerned with the contents of the announcements and did not wish to get involved in what it considered a trivial matter. It was, therefore, not prepared to authorize this change.

23. Index of Research

The McGill Index of Research, recently published by

the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, was criticized for its lack of information concerning the funding and conditions of research grants. The Committee expressed the opinion that this Index might, however, be good for public relations. The Committee agreed to carry this over as the first item on the agenda at its next meeting.

24. CEGEPs Information

Moved by Mr. Ryan, seconded by Mr. Lovell:

Be it resolved that the chairman of this Committee approach the Admissions Office and the Schools Liaison Officer with a view to intensifying the University's recruitment campaign of students from French CEGEPs by distributing to all French CEGEPs the necessary (translated) documents to enable and encourage these students to apply to McGill. Such information would include admissions requirements, posters, etc. and emphasize the possibility of French-language students being able to study at McGill. (Passed unanimously. R. F. Shaw)

25. Information for Graduates and Friends of McGill

Mr. Hallward brought up the question of keeping graduates and friends of the University accurately informed about important incidents which arise at the University. He mentioned specifically the Monday, January 27, meeting of the Board of Governors. Incidents of this nature are of great interest to graduates but the only source of information they had was the local press and he felt that it would be useful to have some system of providing them with accurate and objective information. After some discussion, it was agreed that this matter should be brought forward for consideration at a later meeting of the Committee. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.

The student housing issue

STATEMENT TO SENATE ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5

BY R. F. SHAW, VICE-PRINCIPAL (ADMINISTRATION)

At the Senate meeting on February 1 certain information was presented describing "The Issues" which, in my opinion, require further clarification to permit the university community to make a balanced assessment of the problem.

Student-owned and operated housing

This item was on the agenda of the disrupted Board of Governors' Meeting and a report had been prepared for presentation at that time. A copy of this report, as finally presented to the Executive Committee of the Board, is presented for inclusion in the minutes of this meeting.

It was reported accurately that the Board of Governors, on the recommendation of the Vice-Principal (Administration), decided that the University endowment funds should not be used for any of the three housing projects which the University considers to be of high priority. The reason for this policy is that the University believes these funds are available from the Quebec Housing Corporation and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Therefore, in the present uncertainties with respect to university financing generally, it was felt that University funds should remain flexible. It is still the opinion of the administration that funds are available from government sources. Should there be any change in this situation, the matter, would, of course, be reconsidered.

At a meeting of the Capital Funds Committee in Quebec on February 3, 1969, the University presented the three housing projects now contemplated, under the heading of "urgent items".

Government requires prior approval

It was accurately reported at Senate on February 1 that the Vice-Principal (Administration) had refused to provide 50% of the approximately \$4,500 required for an option on a lot for the student-owned and operated residence. It should be added that this decision arose from a requirement of the Department of Education who have informed the universities that prior approval of the government is required for any university project regardless of the source of funds and that if funds are expended without such approval, then the project on which the funds are expended is no longer eligible for government assistance. The University of Montreal advises that this requirement has been enforced on one of their projects. It does not seem wise, therefore, to jeopardize the University's position, particularly when the sum involved is of a size which is well within the financial capacity of the Students' Society.

Notice to the Board of Governors

on student housing project January 29, 1969

Based on the request of the Students' Executive Council, forwarded on November 12, 1968, the Board of Governors on November 25, 1968 approved a submission in support of a housing project being undertaken by the Students' Society of McGill University. Under this arrangement the key provisions were as follows:

- The students should exercise authority and carry responsibility.

- The residence to be moved to the Montreal Campus with the Faculty of Education for which funds are already approved by Quebec, the Students' Society residence and the Married Students' residence were given top priority.

- The University agreed to make a loan not to exceed \$500,000 to permit the work to be put in hand prior to the final arrangement for financing and subject only to the ability of the Students' Society to assemble the

property or obtain the necessary permits and approvals

- For permanent financing, it was agreed that the University would assist the Students' Society to obtain a 100% mortgage from Quebec Housing Corporation or, alternatively, that the University would itself borrow the funds and complete a lease-back arrangement with the Students' Society.

- In view of the fact that mortgage funds are apparently available, it was agreed that financing should be by mortgage and that the University's investment funds should be retained for other projects where financing is not so readily obtainable.

The history of the events since November 25, 1968 is as follows:

- 1) The Vice Principal (Administration) immediately called on Dr. Germain Gauthier, Director General of Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Quebec and informed him of these plans. He replied that the Government of Quebec had adopted a policy that all student-owned and operated housing where loans are to be made by Quebec Housing Corporation must be under the control of La Fédération Co-op Habitat du Québec. In such cases, approval by the Department of Education is not required. He also advised that in the event that the University itself borrowed money from the Quebec Housing Corporation, then it would be necessary for the University to obtain the prior approval of the Department of Education for the project. This policy is adopted by the Department of Education for all self-financed capital projects on the grounds that if a project gets into financial difficulty, then the Department of Education will be obliged to pick up the tab.

Dr. Gauthier further advised that for any projects where financial commitments are made, whether with University or borrowed funds, without prior approval of the Department, then on such projects the University could not thereafter make any claim on Provincial funds for either capital or operating.

- 2) Following the meeting with Dr. Gauthier, the University made formal application to the Department of Education for the student-sponsored residence. It is expected that the details of our capital submission will be discussed in Quebec next week.

- 3) The Chairman of the Housing Committee of the Students' Executive Council was immediately informed of the situation and he advised that the Students' Society felt that La Fédération Co-op Habitat du Québec was granted such powers by its incorporating act and could, therefore, exercise so much control over the project, that the objective of full authority and full responsibility by students could not be achieved.

- 4) A meeting was, therefore, arranged in Quebec between the students, the Director General of Higher Education and the Quebec Housing Corporation. The students presented their case but received the same information as reported above from the first meeting.

- 5) The Chairman of the Housing Committee of the Students' Executive Council then asked the advice of the Vice Principal (Administration) and was informed that whatever the source of funds for a loan to the Students' Society, it would be expected that the lender would require normal safeguards such as a mortgage agreement and probably a seat on the Board of Directors of the housing group. On the basis of this advice, the Students' Executive Council decided to further explore the Co-op Habitat arrangement.

- 6) One meeting has been held between the Chairman of the Students' Housing Committee and Co-op Habitat and a second meeting is now scheduled where the Students' Executive Council will present a proposal to that group.

- 7) In the meantime, the University's offer stands for the alternative financing arrangement, subject only to the approval of the Department of Education. However, until the further meeting with the Co-op Habitat, no further request is expected from the Students' Council.

8) The Students' Executive Council had selected an excellent site which, however, was picked up by option by a development company. When this option expired, the Vice Principal (Administration) advised that in view of the fact that the student project was bound to proceed, the Council should take an option so that it could commence the preparation of plans and specifications. The Students' Executive Council asked the University to share the cost (about \$4,500) of the new option. This was refused because:

It went beyond the conditions approved by the Governors and would, therefore, require resubmission

It endangered the University's position with regard to the submission to the Department of Education

The total amount was well within the financial capacity of the Students' Society.

No option was taken by the Students' Executive Council and the developer renewed his option. The students are, therefore, looking for another site.

Broadening the base of the Board

STATEMENT TO SENATE ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5

BY R. F. SHAW, VICE-PRINCIPAL (ADMINISTRATION)

It should be noted that the Board of Governors and Senate both approved the recommendation of the Committee on University Government that there be a Membership Committee of the Board of Governors (as distinct from its Nominating Committee) which shall seek nominees representative of the various parts of the community which the University services such as agencies of government, research, the professions, business, labour, and the arts. This procedure was recommended to ensure that the nominees to the Board are not only broadly representative but that they should be persons able to carry out effectively the responsibility of membership on the Board and its committees. The Board has appointed its three members to this committee and on January 24, 1969 the Secretary of the Board reminded the Secretary of Senate that Senate should also appoint three members to this committee.

Academic announcements

Arctic Institute appoints 1969 governors

The following are the governors for 1969 of the Arctic Institute of North America, with the first four mentioned being the members of the Institute's executive committee:

Trevor Lloyd, chairman; Richard H. Nolte, vice-chairman; Sverre Orvig, secretary; Patrick H. O'Neill, treasurer; C. Earl Albrecht, Jean Beetz, W. S. Benninghoff, Colin B. B. Bull, M. J. Dunbar, Joseph O. Fletcher, William M. Gilchrist, Eric Gourdeau, Laurence Irving, W. O. Kupsch, Helge E. Larsen, P. D. McTaggart-Cowan, David C. Nutt, Troy L. Péwé, Norbert Untersteiner, John Useem, and William S. Ziegler.

Canada Council grants

McGill has received a grant of \$5,000 to bring Professor Jan Adam of Charles University, Prague, to the Department of Economics and Political Science for the academic year 1968-69.

Professor Alfred J. Frueh to University of Connecticut

Professor Frueh, who is a specialist in mineralogy and crystallography, has accepted appointment as head of the University's of Connecticut's department of Geology and Geography. He will take up his new post in September of this year.

23rd Annual Eastern Colleges Science Conference

This year's conference will take place at Yale University on April 10-12. The major purpose of the conference is the stimulation of undergraduate interest in the natural and social sciences by providing a forum for the exchange of ideas between undergraduate science students, including presentation and discussion of research papers. Participation is open to all colleges and universities. Presentation of a paper is not a prerequisite for registration, however, nor is there a limit on the number of people registering from one institution. Those interested are asked to contact, Thomas Kimball, conference co-ordinator, 244-A Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut, 06520, as early as possible.

Study in Jerusalem

The Hebrew University in Jerusalem offers a variety of study programmes, undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate research, specifically for Canadian and other overseas students. [Full degree and special visiting student programmes for credit.] For further details and scholarship information write, giving details of year and field of study and average grade of university studies, to Canadian Friends of the Hebrew University, 1506 McGregor, Montreal 109 or telephone 932-2133.

NATIONAL DESIGN COUNCIL Scholarships and grants program

Scholarships—Available to person engaged in industrial design and to students of design for advanced study in Canada and abroad in the field of industrial design. Amount determined by the applicants commitments to the institute he will attend. Scholarships will normally be awarded to applicants with proven ability in design, who are employed in the field of industrial design and hold an acceptable degree or diploma in industrial design or related fields. Applications and further information from the Registrar. Deadline—April 1.

Grants for Research Projects—Available to persons qualified to engage in research projects directly related to industrial design, in areas which could be of importance to Canadian industry. Grant payments are made directly to individual applicants. The first payment will be sufficient to commence the project. All individuals or members of groups must have proven ability to carry out the intended research and hold an acceptable degree or diploma in a course related to the type of work to be undertaken. Deadline—April 1.

Grants for design promotion—Available to institutes and organizations qualified to sponsor and carry out activities promoting industrial design in Canada. The first payment will be sufficient to commence the project. Institutes and organizations applying for grants must be located in and intend to sponsor and carry out the program in Canada. Applications and further information from the Registrar. Deadline—April 1.

L'UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC EN MARCHÉ

Lors de la dernière session du parlement québécois, le gouvernement a adopté la loi qui crée l'Université du Québec (Bill 88).

En vertu de cette loi, l'Université du Québec ouvrira en septembre 1969 des campus universitaires à Montréal, Chicoutimi et Trois-Rivières et encadrera le développement des enseignements supérieurs à Hull et à Rimouski.

Dès l'automne, le campus de Montréal doit recevoir près de 6,000 étudiants, celui de Trois-Rivières près de 2,000, tandis qu'à Chicoutimi on comptera environ 1,500 étudiants.

Modeste au début, l'Université du Québec offrira des programmes d'études dont la gamme sera aussi étendue que celle des universités existantes, en évitant cependant certaines spécialités peu recherchées. Elle prévoit donc l'accueil dans l'ensemble de ses cités universitaires de près de 10,000 étudiants de premier cycle en 1969-70, 20,000 en 1976-77 et 30,000 en 1981-82. A ces étudiants s'ajouteront ceux qui prépareront des diplômes de maîtrise et de doctorat.

Pour assurer l'enseignement et la recherche, l'université du Québec devra compter sur 700 professeurs et spécialistes en 1969-70, 1,500 en 1976-77 et plus de 2,000 en 1981-82.

C'est la Direction générale de l'enseignement supérieur, Ministère de L'Éducation, qui a la responsabilité de l'organisation et du démarrage de l'Université du Québec.

La Direction peut donc fournir aux intéressés toute information concernant les possibilités de carrière à l'un des campus de l'Université du Québec et transmettre aux personnes responsables les demandes d'engagement qui lui parviendront.

NOTICES OF MEETINGS

February 17-24

MONDAY 17: Council, Faculty of Arts & Science: 3:30 p.m., Arts Council Rm.

TUESDAY 18: Deans: Principal's Office 12:15 p.m. Executive, M.A.U.T.: 12:30 p.m., Faculty Club. Engineering Academic Committee: 2 p.m., Engineering Faculty Room.

Senate Committee on Collegial Studies: 4:10 p.m., Arts Council Rm.

WEDNESDAY 19: Senate: 2:20 p.m., Leacock Council Room.

THURSDAY 20: Senate Committee on Development: 2:30 p.m., Room 609, Administration Bldg. Biological Sciences, Div. III: Room S 3/6, 4:10 p.m. Stewart Biology Bldg.

FRIDAY 21: Lectures cancelled, mid-term Holiday, Winter Carnival.

MONDAY 24: Board of Governors: 4 p.m., Room 609, Administration Bldg.